CCSD's

DISABILITY INFORMATION SHEET

No. 10
2003

Two Themes: Workplace Issues and Personal Security

In this tenth edition of **CCSD's Disability Information Sheets**, we provide statistics on two separate themes. The first involves workers with disabilities and the workplace. As you will see, workers with disabilities often have less access to training than do persons without disabilities, and when they do receive training, it is more likely to be less formal in nature. As well, workers with disabilities are less likely to be promoted. The source of data for this theme is Statistics Canada's Workplace and Employee Survey (WES), 1999. It should be noted that WES does not survey workplaces in crop and animal production, fishing, hunting and trapping, private households, public administration, or workplaces in any of the Territories.

The second theme covered in this edition involves persons with disabilities and issues of personal security. Persons with disabilities are less likely to feel secure about their overall personal safety from crime and they are less secure about other threats to their personal safety, such as the threat of hunger. Data for this theme are from the National Population Health Survey (NPHS) 1998/99 and General Social Survey (GSS), Cycle 13, Victimization, 1999, and the National Longitudinal Survey of Children and Youth (NLSCY), 1996 and 1998.

THE WORKPLACE

Training

As we face the economic challenges of the 21st Century, there is an increasing focus on the importance of education, training, and skills in developing the Canadian workforce. Added to this challenge are expected labour shortages as "baby boomers" begin to retire from the paid workforce. In order to help meet these challenges, it will be increasingly important that the abilities and potential of persons with disabilities in the labour market be fully developed, and to do so, we must understand as much as

possible about their workplace experiences with training and skill development. Even more importantly perhaps, fully developing the abilities and potential of persons with disabilities in the labour market is essential to the goal of full citizenship.

Using the WES, we find that there are only small differences overall in the percentage of persons with and without disabilities who have no training in the workplace.[1] Men with disabilities were the most likely to report having no training of any sort (47.7%), while 46.9% of men without disabilities said they had received no training, as did 45.1% of women with disabilities, and 43.6% of women without disabilities. This latter group were the least likely to report that they had received no training in the previous 12 months (see Table 1).

It is important, however, to examine the *type of training* received. "Classroom-only training" includes training related to a person's job that has a predetermined format with predetermined goals and specific content. "On-the-job training" is less formal; it usually takes place while a person is performing the job duties and typically is provided by co-workers, supervisors, or resource people. Some workers reported having both types of training.

There were other noteworthy differences with respect to the type of training given to persons with and

Table 1 **Training for Workers with and without Disabilities, by Gender**

Type of Training	Persons with Disabilities		Persons without Disabilities	
	Male	Female	Male	Female
Neither type	47.7%	45.1%	46.9%	43.6%
Classroom only	19.9%	21.7%	25.0%	25.2%
On-the-job	21.4%	20.9%	16.0%	19.2%
Both types	11.1%	12.2%	12.1%	12.1%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Calculations by the Canadian Council on Social Development using data from Statistics Canada's Workplace and Employee Survey (WES), 1999.

CCSD's Disability Information Sheet is published by the Canadian Council on Social Development (CCSD) with funding support from Human Resources Development Canada.

To be added to or deleted from the mailing list for this series of *Disability Information Sheets*, please contact:

CCSD's Disability Research Information Program
309 Cooper Street, 5th Floor, Ottawa, ON K2P 0G5
Tel: (613) 236-8977; fax: (613) 236-2750
E-mail: drip@ccsd.ca

This *Information Sheet* is also available on the CCSD's website at www.ccsd.ca/drip in both PDF and HTML formats.

All rights reserved.
ISBN 0-88810-504-5
Publications Mail Agreement N° 40012390

The CCSD is a United Way member agency.

[1] This refers to training within the last 12 months.

those without disabilities. As summarized in Table 1, persons without disabilities were more likely than those with disabilities to have "classroom-only training." For example, 25.0% of men without disabilities and 25.2% of women without disabilities reported receiving this type of training, compared with 19.9% of men with disabilities and 21.7% of women with disabilities. Further investigation needs to be done to determine more about differences in the nature and amount of training received. These findings suggest that persons with disabilities may be more likely to have less formalized training and this, in turn, may mean that fewer organizational resources are devoted to them.

Does age matter?

Age is definitely a factor in terms of access to training for persons with disabilities. While we did not see very large differences between persons with and those without disabilities with respect to *whether* they received training, data presented in Table 2 indicate that the situation is actually more complex than it appears. When we examine the situation of older workers (that is, those aged 50 and older) with and without disabilities, we can see that for older workers, access to training can be problematic.

Among older workers with disabilities, 42.3% said they had received some form of training (20.7% + 13.4% + 8.2%), compared with 47.8% of older workers without disabilities (25.3% + 13.3% + 9.2%). Among younger workers, 58.1% of those with disabilities had received some training and 56.5% of those without disabilities had training. This means that among workers under age 50, those with disabilities were very slightly more likely than those without disabilities to have received some training.

Yet the opposite was the case among workers aged 50 and older. There appears to be a large drop in access to on-the-job training as workers with disabilities get older: 24.2% of younger workers with disabilities received such training, whereas only 13.4% of their

Table 2 **Training for Workers with and without Disabilities, by Age Group***

Type of Training	Persons with Disabilities		Persons without Disabilities	
	Under 50	Aged 50+	Under 50	Aged 50+
Neither type	41.9%	57.7%	43.4%	52.2%
Classroom only	20.9%	20.7%	25.0%	25.3%
On-the-job	24.2%	13.4%**	18.7%	13.3%
Both types	13.0%	8.2%	12.8%	9.2%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	99.9%	100.0%

* In this analysis, workers were divided into two groups: those under 50 years of age, and those aged 50 and older.

** Figures should be used with caution.

Source: Calculations by the Canadian Council on Social Development using data from Statistics Canada's Workplace and Employee Survey (WES), 1999.

older counterparts had on-the-job training. As well, noticeably fewer older workers with disabilities reported having both classroom-only training and on-the-job training (8.2% compared with 13% among younger workers with disabilities).

Among workers without disabilities, older workers also had lower levels of training – in particular, they had lower levels of on-the-job training. However, workers without disabilities were still more likely than those with disabilities to have had classroom-only training at any age.

Are these data evidence of a greater unwillingness to invest in the training of older workers with disabilities? Or are these differences due to the type of work typically performed by older workers with disabilities, or differences in their type of employer? More investigation is needed of the workplace situation faced by older workers with disabilities in order to better understand these findings.

Does Education Matter?

Education is an important factor in determining whether a worker with or without disabilities receives training. Among workers with disabilities, 60.3% of university graduates reported getting some type of training (32.4% + 19.7% + 8.2%), compared with 58.8% of those with college or some university education, and only 46.8% of those who had a high school education or less (see Table 3). Among workers without disabilities, 67.1% of university graduates reported receiving some training, compared with 58.1% of those with college or some university, and 45.1% of those with a high school education or less. Among both workers with and those without disabilities, university graduates were more likely to have received classroom-only training.

Among workers with a university degree, those without disabilities were twice as likely to report having had *both* on-the-job training and classroom training (19.4% compared with 8.2% among their disabled counterparts).

Table 3

Training for Workers with and without Disabilities, by Education Level Achieved

Type of Training	Persons with Disabilities			Persons without Disabilities		
	High school or less	College or some University	University Degree	High school or less	College or some University	University Degree
Neither type	53.2%	41.2%	39.7%	54.9%	41.9%	32.9%
Classroom only	15.3%	23.8%	32.4%	18.8%	27.1%	33.5%
On-the-job	20.4%	22.1%	19.7%	19.3%	17.6%	14.3%
Both types	11.1%	12.9%*	8.2%*	7.1%	13.4%	19.4%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

* Figures should be used with caution.
Source: Calculations by the Canadian Council on Social Development using data from Statistics Canada's Workplace and Employee Survey (WES), 1999.

University-educated workers with disabilities were more likely than those without disabilities to report having only on-the-job training (19.7% and 14.3% respectively), and they were also more likely to report having no training at all (39.7% and 32.9%). Yet while higher levels of education improve the likelihood of training for workers with disabilities, a university degree still does not lead to the overall levels of training enjoyed by university graduates without disabilities; in particular, it does not lead to more formal training opportunities.

Promotions and Training

For both workers with and those without disabilities, training is associated with promotions. Workers who report having had training are more likely to have been promoted while working for their present employer.[2] For example, among workers with disabilities, 25.8% of those who had no training reported having been promoted, compared with 42% of those who had received training. Among workers without disabilities, 31.7% of those who had not received training had been promoted, compared with 44.6% of those who had had training. Regardless of any training, however, workers without disabilities were more likely than those with disabilities to have been promoted, and promotions were least likely among workers with disabilities who had not received any training.

Does promotion bring with it greater access to training? Does training lead to a greater chance of promotion? Are training and promotion both characteristics of different career opportunities? More research needs to be done to determine the nature of this association. (And it is important to remember that a number of industries – and in particular, public administration – are not covered by the WES.)

Promotions and Gender

Gender is another important element in promotions, with men more likely than women to report having had promotions. And it is women with disabilities who are the least likely to be promoted: only 32.9% of women with disabilities reported having had a promotion with their present employer. This compares with 35.6% among women without disabilities and 36% among men with disabilities. Men without disabilities were the most likely to report having been promoted (42.3%).

PERSONAL SECURITY

Food Insecurity

Persons with disabilities are more likely than those without disabilities to experience food insecurity, and this is particularly true among the younger age groups. Food insecurity involves

[2] The promotion might have occurred at any time while working for the present employer. Unfortunately, there is no way of knowing if the person received promotions while working for previous employers, or if the move to the present employer might have been considered a "move up."

Table 4 **Food Insecurity among Persons with and without Disabilities, by Age and Gender**

	Age Group			
	15 to 34	35 to 49	50 to 64	Aged 65+
Persons with Disabilities				
Men	25.0%	20.3%	14.3%	6.4%
Women	24.4%	24.1%	19.5%	7.0%
Persons without Disabilities				
Men	10.6%	7.7%	4.1%	2.4%
Women	12.0%	8.9%	4.9%	2.5%

Source: Calculations by the Canadian Council on Social Development using data from the National Population Health Survey (NPHS) 1998/99.

going without food because of a lack of money, eating less than required due to lack of money, and/or worrying about not being able to buy food due to lack of money. About one-quarter of women and men aged 15 to 34 with disabilities experienced food insecurity (24.4% and 25%, respectively) compared with 12% and 10.6% of their non-disabled counterparts.

Food insecurity decreases with age, both for persons with and for those without disabilities. However, the gap between the groups remains strong within all age groups[3] (see Table 4).

Personal Safety

Overall, persons without disabilities are more satisfied with their personal safety than are persons with disabilities, and men are more satisfied than women with their personal safety. Men without disabilities were the most satisfied with their personal safety – 53.8% reported being "very satisfied" compared with 47.9% of men with disabilities. Among women, 40.2% of those without disabilities and 34.3% of those with disabilities were very satisfied with their personal safety (see Table 5).

Across Canada, there were differences with respect to the degree of satisfaction with personal safety, however, the gap between persons with and those without disabilities remained in every region. People in the Atlantic region reported the highest degree of satisfaction, while those in Quebec were the least satisfied (see Table 6).

[3] If we look only at the most "extreme" component of the food security index – that is, not having enough food to eat due to lack of money – we find that 10.8% of men aged 15 to 34 with disabilities and 9% of women with disabilities in the same age group experienced this form of food insecurity. (Comparable figures for men and women aged 15 to 34 without disabilities were 4.3% and 5%.) Among people aged 35 to 49, 10.1% of men with disabilities and 11.8% of women with disabilities went without food due to lack of money, compared with 3.1% and 3.4% of their counterparts without disabilities. Among those aged 50 to 64, 6.3% of men with disabilities and 9.1% of women with disabilities went without food, compared with 1.5% and 1.9% of their non-disabled counterparts. (Data for those aged 65 and older cannot be released due to small sample size.)

Table 5 **Satisfaction with Personal Safety, Persons with and without Disabilities, by Gender**

	With Disability		Without Disability	
Degree of Satisfaction	Men	Women	Men	Women
Very satisfied	47.9%	34.3%	53.8%	40.2%
Somewhat satisfied	46.4%	54.1%	42.6%	52.6%
Somewhat to Very dissatisfied	5.7%	11.6%	3.5%	7.2%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	99.9%	100.0%

Note: Totals may not add to 100% due to rounding.
Source: Calculations by the Canadian Council on Social Development using data from Statistics Canada's General Social Survey (GSS) Cycle 13, Victimization, 1999.

Table 6 **Personal Safety among Adults with and without Disabilities, by Region**

	Per cent who were "Very satisfied"	
Region	With Disability	Without Disability
Atlantic	56.2%	66.5%
Quebec	34.6%	41.0%
Ontario	41.3%	48.0%
Prairies	42.1%	48.0%
British Columbia	36.1%	43.0%

Source: Calculations by the Canadian Council on Social Development using data from Statistics Canada's General Social Survey (GSS) Cycle 13, Victimization, 1999.

Afraid to Go Out at Night

As a precautionary measure against crime, persons with disabilities are more likely than those without disabilities to report that they routinely "stay in at night because they are afraid to go out alone." However, the most important factor in keeping people in at night is gender: 27.1% of women with disabilities and 14.3% of women without disabilities reported that they remained home at night because they were afraid to go out alone. Comparable figures for men were 4.7% (men with disabilities) and 1.8% (men without disabilities).

Walking Alone After Dark

Persons with disabilities – and particularly women – are less likely than people without disabilities to walk alone (or use a wheelchair) after dark in their neighbourhood. This refers not just to "going out alone at night," but to "walking around or using a wheelchair after dark." Among persons with disabilities, 29.9% of the women said they simply did not walk or wheel alone after dark, compared with 9.4% of their male counterparts. Among persons without disabilities, 11.7% of women and 2.8% of men reported that they did not walk alone at night in their neighbourhood.

Among those who **do** walk or wheel alone after dark in their neighbourhood, both gender and disability were important factors in their feelings of safety when out alone. Among women, only 27.7% of those with disabilities and 28.1% of those without disabilities reported feeling "very safe" from crime when walking or wheeling alone after dark. Among men, 50.7% of those with disabilities and 55.8% of those without disabilities felt "very safe" from crime when walking or wheeling alone after dark.

And finally . . .

While the security issues examined in this *Disability Information Sheet* have dealt with adults, we felt it was also important to provide an indicator focused on children. One important threat to the security of children is bullying at school – both physical and psychological.

Using data from the 1996 and 1998 National Longitudinal Survey of Children and Youth (NLSCY), we examined the percentage of children aged 10 and 11 who reported that they were bullied at school "all or most of the time." As illustrated in Table 7, children with special needs were more than twice as likely as those without special needs to report such constant bullying. In 1996, 3.7% of children without special needs reported being bullied all or most of the time, whereas 9.7% of children with special needs reported constant bullying. In 1998, both figures were slightly higher at 5% and 10.6% respectively. Constant bullying is a bigger problem for children with special needs, however, these data suggest that the problem may be on the rise for all children.

Similarly, children with special needs were more likely than those without special needs to report being bullied "some of the time," and there was a noteworthy increase in this rate between 1996 and 1998 – particularly for children with special needs. Overall, bullying at school is a greater problem for children with special needs, and the evidence suggests that it is on the rise. This is another area where more study is needed.

Table 7 **Children aged 10 to 11 with Special Needs being Bullied at School, 1996 & 1998**

	Special needs		No special needs	
% Bullied	1996	1998	1996	1998
All or most of the time	9.7%*	10.6%*	3.7%*	5.0%*
Some of the time	6.5%*	12.2%*	5.5%	6.4%
Rarely or never	83.9%	77.2%	90.8%	88.6%
Total	100.1%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Note: Special needs includes learning and emotional disabilities, as well as physical disabilities. See *CCSD's Disability Information Sheet* No. 3 for more details.

* Estimate less reliable due to small sample size.

Source: Calculations by the Canadian Council on Social Development using the National Longitudinal Survey of Children and Youth, 1996 and 1998.